UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/442,150	11/18/1999	REINER KRAFT	AM9-99-0095	5474

21254 7590 05/07/2003

MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD
SUITE 200
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER	
PARTON, KEVIN S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2153	10

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/442,150	KRAFT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin Parton	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Due to further review by both the examiner and a senior examiner, the allowance of claims 1-9, 22-33, and the objections to claims 11-16 as being allowable are withdrawn. The new grounds of rejection is shown below.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10 and 17-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following portions of the claim are unclear:

a. Abstracts are generated from pointers without ever retrieving the document data;

b. The origin of the stream of data that is displayed next to the smaller of the visual abstracts.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 22-24, 27-29, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

7. Regarding claims 22, 29, and 30 Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach a system for searching for a document with means for:

a. Supplying a search request (figure 7).

b. Providing abstracts of documents on a screen display that correspond to the search request, the abstracts including a written summary and a first visual abstract of each of said documents (figure 3).

c. The abstract being a thumbnail image (figure 3). Note that a reduced size image is a thumbnail.

Although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose:

a. Creating a second visual abstract of one of the documents, wherein the second visual abstract is larger than the first visual abstract.

b. Displaying the second visual abstract when requested by a user.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the use of a large and a small visual abstract. This benefits the system by allowing a user to see a less degraded

version of a site without having to download the full page to a browser. If the information needed is not clear from the smaller version, the larger version may be useful.

Further, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the use of the larger abstract for presentation to the user. This benefits the system by allowing users to more easily view and interpret the results than the small rendering.

8. Regarding claims 23 and 31, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitations as applied to claims 22 and 30, respectively. Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) further teach means wherein said visual abstract is created by manipulating a source document so as to enhance visibility of at least a first portion of the source document (figure 4; column 3, lines 16-20).

9. Regarding claim 24, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all limitations as applied to claim 23. Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) further teach means wherein the first portion corresponds to one of a title and a heading of the document (figure 3; figure 6).

10. Regarding claims 27 and 28, although Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all limitations (as applied to claim 22), they fail to disclose means wherein the storage of the abstract (as discussed in claim 11) includes a cache database that deletes the file after a pre-determined time.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176)

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the use of a cache database for storage of the abstracts. The abstracts over time would take up far too much space

and would not be useful to the user. A cache memory by definition is easily accessible and stores for a period of time or usage.

11. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) in view of Barros (USPN 6,307,573).

12. Regarding claim 25, although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) (as applied to claim 22) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the second visual abstract is displayed on the display screen when the use moves a pointing device over a corresponding one of the first visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) as evidenced by Barros (USPN 6,307,573).

In an analogous art, Barros (USPN 6,307,573) discloses a system display of query results with means wherein the second visual abstract is displayed on the display screen when the use moves a pointing device over a corresponding one of the first visual abstracts (figure 5b, element 150; figure 6d).

Given the teaching of Barros (USPN 6,307,573), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the display of the larger abstract when a portion of the screen is pointed to by the user. This allows the user to more easily see information about the possible topic of interest.

13. Regarding claim 26, although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) (as applied to claim 25) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose

means for removing the second visual abstract from the display screen when the user moves the pointing device away from the corresponding one of the first visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) as evidenced by Barros (USPN 6,307,573).

In an analogous art, Barros (USPN 6,307,573) discloses a system for return of user query results wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is removed from the display screen when the cursor is moved away from the smaller one of the visual abstracts (figure 5b, element 150; figure 6d).

Given the teaching of Barros (USPN 6,307,573), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by removing the pop-up abstract or result when the mouse moves away from the origin point. This is very common in the art and speeds the users access to a large number of records. It decreases required mouse clicks and avoids wasted computer resources.

14. Claims 1-6, 10-13, and 17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) in view of Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654).

15. Regarding claim 1, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach a system for processing search results in response to a user query with means for:

a. Providing document pointers returned by a search engine to identify a source from which documents are available (column 3, lines 10-11);

b. Generating a visual abstract for one of the documents, the visual abstract being a thumbnail image (figure 3; column 3, lines 6-7).

c. Formatting a stream of data such that when said data is displayed on a display screen, each visual abstract appears associated with a search result (figure 3). (figure 3).

Although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose:

a. Means for generating a second visual abstract of, the abstract being a thumbnail image of a different size

b. The visual representation is specifically located adjacent to the location.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

In an analogous art, Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) disclose a system for the display of links along with visual "iconic" representations. The system presents the visual representation adjacent to the location of the link (figure 4). Note that while this is not a search result specifically, the application is in the same field of endeavor and it could easily be applied to the system of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

Given the teaching of Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the display of the visual representation adjacent to a textual search result. While the system of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) relies on a visual representation of distance to show relevance, it is obvious that adding information to the screen could aid users in finding the correct site. The addition of data adjacent to a visual representation

is well know in the art and provides the benefit of allowing users to see a purely visual cue from which more detailed information can be gleaned by reading the text.

Further, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the use of a large and a small visual abstract. This benefits the system by allowing a user to see a less degraded version of a site without having to download the full page to a browser. If the information needed is not clear from the smaller version, the larger version may be useful.

16. Regarding claim 2, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means wherein the visual abstract is generated by manipulating said document so as to enhance said visibility of at least a portion of said document while degrading visibility of at least another portion of said document (figure 4; column 3, lines 16-20).

17. Regarding claim 3, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 2. They further teach means wherein the manipulating is performed by filtering the document (column 3, lines 3-20; column 8, lines 13-15).

18. Regarding claim 4, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 3. They further teach means wherein the filtering is performed on an image in the document (column 3, lines 3-20; column 8, lines 13-15). Note that the reference treats all parts of a document and would filter out images in the results.

19. Regarding claim 5, although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) (as applied to claim 1) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means

comprising displaying a larger one of said visual abstracts on said display screen when requested by said user.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the use of the larger abstract for presentation to the user. This benefits the system by allowing users to more easily view and interpret the results than the small rendering.

20. Regarding claim 6, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 1. They further teach means for storing data relating to the larger one of the visual abstracts (figure 3). Note that information on all sizes of abstracts is stored.

21. Regarding claim 10, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach a system for processing search results obtained in response to a user query, the method comprising:

a. Examining document pointers returned by a search engine to identify a source from which documents are available (column 3, lines 10-11);
b. Obtaining said documents from said source (figure 6). Note that the return of results is the return of searched documents.
c. Generating a visual abstract for each of said documents (figure 3; column 3, lines 6-7), each visual abstract being a thumbnail image, each thumbnail image comprising a visual similarity of the document as reduced in size, each thumbnail image formed by manipulating a corresponding source document so as to enhance visibility of at least a first portion of said source document

while degrading visibility of at least a second portion of said source document (figure 4; column 3, lines 16-20). Note that the visual representation using colors and shapes constitutes a visual abstract of the page; the figure shows a title for the document, this is a visual similarity. Also, in the reference, the title is predominantly shown with all other data is shown in small text or graphical form.

d. Formatting a stream of data such that when said data is displayed on a display screen, each visual abstract appears associated with a search result (figure 3). Note that the data corresponding to the result is visually available.

Although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the visual representation is specifically located adjacent to the location.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176), as evidenced by Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654).

In an analogous art, Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) disclose a system for the display of links along with visual "iconic" representations. The system presents the visual representation adjacent to the location of the link (figure 4). Note that while this is not a search result specifically, the application is in the same field of endeavor and it could easily be applied to the system of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

Given the teaching of Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et

al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the display of the visual representation adjacent to a textual search result. While the system of Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) relies on a visual representation of distance to show relevance, it is obvious that adding information to the screen could aid users in finding the correct site. The addition of data adjacent to a visual representation is well know in the art and provides the benefit of allowing users to see a purely visual cue from which more detailed information can be gleaned by reading the text.

22. Regarding claim 11, although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) (as applied to claim 10) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means for creating a larger visual abstract of one of the documents.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the use of a large and a small visual abstract. This benefits the system by allowing a user to see a less degraded version of a site without having to download the full page to a browser. If the information needed is not clear from the smaller version, the larger version may be useful.

23. Regarding claim 12, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 11. They further teach means for storing data relating to the larger one of the visual abstracts (figure 3). Note that information on all sizes of abstracts is stored.

24. Regarding claim 13, although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) (as applied to claim 11) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose

means comprising displaying a larger one of said visual abstracts on the display screen on demand.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176).

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) by employing the use of the larger abstract for presentation to the user. This benefits the system by allowing users to more easily view and interpret the results than the small rendering.

25. Regarding claim 17, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 10. They further teach means wherein the manipulating is performed by filtering the document (column 3, lines 3-20; column 8, lines 13-15).

26. Regarding claim 18, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 17. They further teach means wherein the filtering is performed on an image in the source document (column 3, lines 3-20; column 8, lines 13-15). Note that images are filtered.

27. Regarding claim 19, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitations as applied to claim 10. They further teach means wherein the first portion of the source document corresponds to one of a title and a heading of the source document (figure 3; figure 6).

28. Regarding claim 20, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all limitations as applied to claim 19. They further teach means wherein one of the title and the heading is enlarged as compared with said second portion of said source document (figure 3).

29. Regarding claim 21, Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) teach all the limitation as applied to claim 10. They further teach means wherein the second portion of the source document corresponds to a body of text of the source document (column 3, lines 3-20).

30. Claims 7-9, 14-16, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) and Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654), further in view of Barros (USPN 6,307,573).

31. Regarding claims 7, 14, and 32, although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) and Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) (as applied to claims 5, 13, and 30, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is displayed on said display screen when a cursor is moved over said smaller one of said visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) and Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) as evidenced by Barros (USPN 6,307,573).

In an analogous art, Barros (USPN 6,307,573) discloses a system display of query results with means for displaying one of the visual abstracts is displayed on the display screen when a cursor is moved over the smaller one of the visual abstracts (figure 5b, element 150; figure 6d).

Given the teaching of Barros (USPN 6,307,573), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) and Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) by employing the display of the abstract when a portion of the screen is pointed to by the user. This allows the user to more easily view the abstract of the possibly relevant topic.

32. Regarding claims 8 and 15, although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) and Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) (as applied to claims 5 and 13, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means comprising removing the larger one of the visual abstracts from the display screen.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176), as evidenced by Barros (USPN 6,307,573).

In an analogous art, Barros (USPN 6,307,573) discloses a system for return of user query results with means for removing the larger one of the visual abstracts from the display screen (figure 5b, element 150; figure 6d).

Given the teaching of Barros (USPN 6,307,573), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) and Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) by removing the displayed abstract when no longer required by the user. This allows the user to easily navigate the page without taking time to actively remove the pop-up screen.

33. Regarding claims 9, 16, and 33, although the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) and Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) (as applied to claims 5, 13, and 30, respectively) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is removed from the display screen when the cursor is moved away from the smaller one of the visual abstracts.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) and Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) as evidenced by Barros (USPN 6,307,573).

In an analogous art, Barros (USPN 6,307,573) discloses a system for return of user query results wherein the larger one of the visual abstracts is removed from the display screen when the cursor is moved away from the smaller one of the visual abstracts (figure 5b, element 150; figure 6d).

Given the teaching of Barros (USPN 6,307,573), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Downs et al. (USPN 6,070,176) and Alexander et al. (USPN 5,986,654) by removing the pop-up abstract or result when the mouse moves away from the origin point. This is very common in the art and speeds the users access to a large number of records. It decreases required mouse clicks and avoids wasted computer resources.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (703)306-0543. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703)305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-9242 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Kevin Parton
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

ksp
May 4, 2003

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100